

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

REC'D 14 AUG 2005

PCT

WIPO

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing
(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

Applicant's or agent's file reference
see form PCT/ISA/220

FOR FURTHER ACTION
See paragraph 2 below

International application No.
PCT/JP2005/009815

International filing date (day/month/year)
23.05.2005

Priority date (day/month/year)
22.05.2004

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC
G01R31/319

Applicant
ADVANTEST CORPORATION

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☐ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office
D-80298 Munich
Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d
Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Authorized Officer

Nadal, R

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-7920



**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/JP2005/009815

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
 - ☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material:
 - ☐ a sequence listing
 - ☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material:
 - ☐ in written format
 - ☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing:
 - ☐ contained in the international application as filed.
 - ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
 - ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/JP2005/009815

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43*bis*.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	
	No: Claims	1,14
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	
	No: Claims	2-13,15-26
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	1-26
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

Re Item V

Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. The following documents are referred to in this communication; the numbering will be adhered to in the rest of the procedure:

D1: WO-A-2004072670

D2: US-A-6,028,439

D3: US-A-2003/0005375

D4: WO-A-2004072669

D5: S. M. Pérez, Y. Furukawa, "Open architecture test system: the new frontier", Proceedings of the 28th International Electronics Manufacturing Technology Symposium, 16-18 July 2003, San Jose, CA, USA, pages 211-214.

2. Regarding to novelty and inventive step, the subject-matter of claims 1 and 14 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT, and the subject-matter of claims 2-13, 15-26 does not involve an inventive step in the sense of Article 33(3) PCT.

2.1. Independent claim 9

Document D1 (the references within parentheses refer to document D1) discloses a modular test system (Fig. 2), comprising:

a controller for controlling at least one test module and its corresponding device under test (Site Controller 104);

a module control framework for establishing a standard module control Interface between a vendor-supplied test module and the modular test system (use of the Module(s) 108; page 2, line 28, page 3, line 14);

means for Installing the vendor-supplied test module and a corresponding vendor-supplied control software module, wherein the vendor-supplied control software module is organized into a plurality of vendor-supplied module control components (page 12, lines 10-21);

means for configuring the modular test system based on the module control framework

and the plurality of vendor-supplied module control components (from page 12, line 29, to page 13, line 25); and
means for accessing the vendor-supplied test module in accordance with the plurality of vendor-supplied module control components using the module control framework (page 13, lines 14-17).

Then, the subject matter of claim 14 is not new and does not meet the requirements of Article 33(2) PCT.

- 2.2. For the sake of completeness the attention of the applicant is drawn to the fact that document D2, in the same technical field, also discloses a modular multi-site test structure (Fig. 1 and Fig. 3 in D2) capable to be expanded with additional test sites, that is, implementing an open architecture, using test programs capable to carry out the synchronization and the access to the different test sites (paragraph [0020] in D2). Moreover, the attention of the applicant is also drawn to the fact that Document D3, in the same technical field, also discloses a modular integrated circuit tester in an open architecture format (D3: Fig. 1; from column 2, line 66, to column 4, line 8), on the other hand, the use of an object oriented language allows the implementation of classes and hierarchies (paragraph [0079]). Furthermore, document D4, in the same technical field also discloses the same open architecture for testing purposes disclosed by the present invention (D4: Fig. 2; from page 15, line 7, to page 17, line 6) which it is, in fact, anticipated by D5 (see Fig. 1a and 1b in D5).

Therefore, not only in view of D1, but also taking into account D2-D5, the subject-matter of claim 14 is not new and does not fulfill the requirements of Article 33(2) PCT.

2.3. Independent claim 1

Since the subject matter of the corresponding method claim 1 is the same as that one of claim 9, claim 1 is not allowable for lack of novelty (Article 33(2) PCT).

2.4. Dependent claims 2-13 and 15-26

Dependent claims 2-13 and 15-26 do not contain any features which, in combination with

the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of inventive step because they consist in the application of well-known design procedures and design alternatives to the person skilled in the art and, therefore, the inventive step has to be ruled out (see Guidelines Part III, Chapter 13, section 13.14(e)).

3. To be also according to the requirements of the PCT, the applicant should also take into account the following remarks:
 - a. Independent claims 1 and 14 are not in the two-part form in accordance with Rule 6.3(b) PCT, which in the present case would be appropriate, with those features known in combination from the prior art being placed in the preamble (Rule 6.3(b)(I) PCT) and with the remaining features being included in the characterising part (Rule 6.3(b)(ii) PCT).
 - b. When the international application contains drawings, the technical features of the claims should be provided with reference signs placed in parentheses to increase the intelligibility of the claims (Rule 6.2(b) PCT), which is not the case of the present application.
 - c. To meet the requirements of Rule 5.1(a)(ii) PCT, documents D1-D5 should be acknowledged in the description.